## BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE:	·N1 JUL 13 PM 2 52
PETITION OF UNITED TELEPHONE	EXECUTIVE SECLETARY
COMPANY TO CHANGE AND INCREASE	EXECUTIVE SECTION
CERTAIN INTRASTATE RATES AND	)
CHARGES SO AS TO PERMIT IT TO EARN	)
A FAIR AND ADEQUATE RATE OF	) Docket No. 01-00451
RETURN ON ITS PROPERTY USED AND	)
USEFUL IN FURNISHING TELEPHONE	)
SERVICE TO ITS CUSTOMERS IN	)
TENNESSEE AND TO ADOPT NEW AND	)
REALISTIC DEPRECIATION RATES FOR	)
CENTRAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT	)

## CONSUMER ADVOCATE AND PROTECTION DIVISION'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO AT&T'S PETITION FOR INTERVENTION

The Attorney General, through the Consumer Advocate and Protection Division ("Attorney General"), opposes the Petition for Intervention filed by AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. ("AT&T") in this matter.

## 1. INTERVENTION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE ACCESS CHARGES ARE NOT AN ISSUE.

It is anticipated that AT&T will attempt to use intervention in this case as a means of trying to reduce the amount of access charges it pays United Telephone Company ("United"). United, however, has assured the Tennessee Regulatory Authority ("TRA") that, "United's Petition to change and increase intrastate rates and charges does not propose to change or increase access line charges."

Response of United in Opposition to the Petition for Intervention of AT&T ("United's Response in Opposition") at 1. Accordingly, access charges are not an issue in this case.

If AT&T is seeking to reduce the access charges of rural local exchange carriers, that issue should be taken up in the already open docket, Access Charge Reform, Docket No. 97-00889. The use

of this forum would assure the development of a consistent policy on access charges, with no one company being targeted by AT&T simply because that company filed a rate case with the TRA.

2. INTERVENTION AND LITIGATION ON ACCESS CHARGES WOULD DELAY THE PROCEEDING.

In addition, in light of the history of AT&T's intervention in the still pending Telephone Electronics Corporation's ("TEC") rate case, Docket No. 99-00995, the proposed intervention is almost certain to delay the present proceeding.

TEC, like United, is a rural local exchange company. TEC and the Attorney General filed a Joint Agreement on a rate reduction on January 7, 2000 for TRA approval. AT&T filed a Petition to Intervene which was granted, then proceeded to serve seven pages of data requests on the issue of access charges. No hearing date has been set for the TEC case. The customers of United deserve a prompt resolution in this case, not a multi-year delay caused by AT&T's attempt to hold any rate case by a rural carrier hostage until AT&T's demands on access charges are met. Accordingly, AT&T's Petition for Intervention should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL G. SUMMERS Attorney General & Reporter MICHAEL E. MOORE Solicitor General

Vance L. Broemel, 11421

Assistant Attorney General

Consumer Advocate and Protection Division

Office of the Attorney General

Post Office Box 20207

Nashville, Tennessee 37202

(615)-741-8700

46783

## **Certificate of Service**

T. G. Pappas, Esq. R. Dale Grimes, Esq. Christopher L. May, Esq. BASS, BERRY & SIMS PLC AmSouth Center 315 Deaderick Street, Suite 2700 Nashville, TN 37238-3001

Richard Collier, Esq. Tennessee Regulatory Authority 450 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243-0505

James P. Lamoureux, Esq. AT&T Room 8100 1200 Peachtree Street N.E. Atlanta, GA 30309

Vance L. Broemel

Assistant Attorney General